

Action Item

Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee

Approval of the Minutes of the April 8, 2002, Meeting

MINUTES

Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee

Meeting of April 8, 2002

Committee members present Olivia K. Singh, *Chair*
Irwin S. Field
Lance Izumi
Robert L. Moore
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*

Other Commissioners present
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Evonne Seron Schulze
Rachel E. Shetka
Howard Welinsky

Committee members absent Susan Hammer, *Vice Chair*
William D. Campbell
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Odessa P. Johnson
Carol Chandler, *ex officio*

Alternate Commissioner present
Ralph R. Pesqueira

Call to order Chair Singh called the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee to order at 4:59 p.m. in the California Chamber of Commerce, California Room, Esquire Plaza, 1215 K Street, 14th Floor, Sacramento. She noted that the minutes from the Committee's January 15, 2002, and February 5, 2002, meetings were approved by the full Commission earlier that morning as part of its Consent Calendar.

Faculty salaries in California public universities, 2002-03

Chair Singh called on staff member Murray J. Haberman to present the faculty salaries report. He reported that the Committee had reviewed a draft of this item at its February meeting and that it was being presented now for the Committee's action.

Mr. Haberman reported on the lag between the salaries paid faculty at the California State University and the University of California and those projected at each system's group of comparison institutions. He noted that the information before the Commissioners is now final and includes the data for all eight of the University of California's comparison institutions, and for all 20 of the California State University's comparison institutions.

Some of the points Mr. Haberman noted included:

- ♦ The projected faculty salary parity figure for California State University is 10.6%.
- ♦ Fifty percent of the California State University faculty are full professors compared to 37% in their comparison group.
- ♦ The projected faculty salary parity figure for the University of California is 7.7%.

- ♦ UC individual rankings are very close to the median of their comparison institutions.

Mr. Haberman indicated that there are implications for competitiveness if faculty do not receive salary increases that are necessary to recruit and retain faculty. In response to a question posed by Commission Chair Arkatov regarding how these parity figures would be impacted by the current slowdown in the national economy, Mr. Haberman indicated that the figures represent previous salary commitments made by the comparison institutions and as a result the current parity figures likely would not change because of changes in the national or state economies.

Chair Arkatov and Commissioner Field both indicated that teaching load and class size also impact the attractiveness of a faculty position and asked if those two factors are considered in the faculty salary comparison calculations. Mr. Haberman said it is not and noted that only salary data and not working conditions are considered in the parity figure calculations.

Commissioner Welinsky asked if data are available about faculty retention and separations, and specifically whether faculty were leaving California's public universities to join the ranks of faculty at private and independent colleges and universities. Mr. Haberman responded that such data are collected. Todd Greenspan of the University of California indicated that he would make those data available to Commissioners interested in the issue.

Commissioner Pesqueira stated that the comparison institutions used for calculating the faculty salary parity figures needs to be reexamined and encouraged the Commission to begin that process as soon as possible.

Adoption of the report was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously by the Committee.

Adjournment	Having no further business, Chair Singh adjourned the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee at 5:11 p.m.
--------------------	---
